UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,110	12/29/2003	Chad Lester	Google-33/APP (GP-086-00-	3154

26479   7590   10/22/2007
STRAUB & POKOTYLO
620 TINTON AVENUE
BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR
TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724

EXAMINER
NOONAN, WILLOW W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2146	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/749,110	LESTER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Willow Noonan	2146	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/29/2003_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The instant application having Application No. 10/749,110 has a total of 38

claims pending in the application; there are 4 independent claims and 34 dependent

claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2.   The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found

to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 C.F.R. 1.63.

Priority

3.   As required by M.P.E.P. 201.14(c), acknowledgement is made of applicant's

claim for priority based on applications filed on January 24, 2003 (U.S. 60/442209).

Drawings

4.   The applicant's drawings submitted are acceptable for examination purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "including *them* in a click URL." There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 8 and 9 recite the phrase "The method 1 wherein" which does not

comport with correct grammatical English.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8.   Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

both Applicant's admitted prior art (hereafter "AAPA") and Granik (U.S. Patent App.

Pub. No. 2002/0010757).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, AAPA and Granik teach a method comprising

encoding one or more ad properties of an ad and including them in a click URL; serving

the ad together with the click URL; and, in response to a user selection of the ad,

decoding the one or more encoded ad properties at an intermediate URL server and

forwarding a content rendering facility of the user to an ad landing page. *See* Present

Application at p. 3 (explaining that "the links in some ads may include links that first

direct user's content rendering application ... to one or more intermediate resources or

servers" which record the click and subsequently redirect the user to the "ad landing

page"); Granik at p. 5, paragraph 43 ("That is, when a web user clicks on an ad ... a link

will take the user to the re-direct server. Particularly, in response to a user click on [an]

ad, a web-based communication is generated that includes a re-direct ad URL

including: 1) an encrypted identifier that identifies the user on the re-direct server; and

2) an ultimate destination website code. The re-direct server particularly parses the re-

direct URL query string for the identifier and the ultimate destination website code and,

by means of a database lookup, maps and transforms the code into a real URL to link

the user to the destination website.").

9.   Claims 2-3 and 21-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Granik.

Regarding claims 2 and 21, Granik teaches that the one or more ad properties

include ad serving parameters. *See* Granik at p. 5, paragraph 43 ("an encrypted

identifier ... [and] ultimate destination website code").

Regarding claims 3 and 22, Granik teaches that the one or more ad properties

include one or more of: an identity of the ad; an identity of the advertiser; a time the ad

was served; a time the ad was rendered; a rendering attribute of the ad; a position of

the ad within a Web page; a price that the advertiser will be charged for the impression;

a price that the advertiser will be charged for a click; a price that the advertiser will be

charged for a conversion; an identity of the server that chose the ad; search conditions

that generated the page with which the ad was rendered; a next intermediate URL; a

final destination URL; an identity of the ad creative, a topic of the content with which the

ad was served; a concept of content with which the ad was served; an identity of the

content with which the ad was served; information about other ads that were rendered

along with the ad; a geolocation to which the ad was served; and user profile

information of the user to which the ad was served. *See* Granik at p. 5, paragraph 43

("re-direct ad URL including ... an encrypted identifier ... [and an] ultimate destination

website code").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 4-9 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Granik in view of RFC 2396 (on URI syntax).

Regarding claims 4-7 and 23-26, RFC2396 teaches that it is well known to use

alphabets limited to specific characters for encoding information. *See generally* RFC

2396. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use the URI specifications of RFC 2396 in Granik's system

because Granik teaches the use of URLs (which are a type of URIs).

Regarding claims 8 and 27, RFC 2396 teaches that the encoded one or more ad

properties are represented with a set of K characters, wherein the set of K characters

excludes one or more characters selected from a set of characters consisting of

"control", "space", "<", ">", and "%". *See* RFC 2396 at p. 10, *Excluded US-ASCII Characters.*

Regarding claims 9 and 28, RFC 2396 teaches that the encoded one or more ad properties are represented with a set of K characters, wherein the set of K characters excludes one or more characters selected from a set of characters consisting of "{", "}", "I", "\", "^", "[", and "]". *See* RFC 2396 at p. 11, *Excluded US-ASCII Characters.*

12.   Claims 10-12, 19, 29-31, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik in view of Tomita (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0035139).

Regarding claims 10 and 29, Granik does not teach representing each of one or more ad properties of an ad with a binary value; concatenating each of the one or more binary values to define a sequence of bits; or encoding the sequence of bits into a sequence of characters, wherein each of the characters is selected from a set of K legal characters. However, Tomita teaches that it is well known to encode binary data and parameters as a string of valid characters. *See* Tomita at p. 10, paragraph 213 ("the data of the firmware has been converted to US-ASCII code according to Base 64 conversion in order to be attached to the e-mail. Therefore, the CPU converts the character string back to binary data according to reverse Base64 conversion"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tomita's technique for encoding data in Granik's system because Tomita teaches that encoding binary data as a character string is well known method for transferring information on a computer network. *See id.*

Regarding claims 11 and 30, Granik teaches that the one or more ad properties include ad serving parameters. *See* Granik at p. 5, paragraph 43 ("an encrypted identifier ... [and] ultimate destination website code").

Regarding claims 12 and 31, Granik teaches that the one or more ad properties include one or more of: an identity of the ad; an identity of the advertiser; a time the ad was served; a time the ad was rendered; a rendering attribute of the ad; a position of the ad within a Web page; a price that the advertiser will be charged for the impression; a price that the advertiser will be charged for a click; a price that the advertiser will be charged for a conversion; an identity of the server that chose the ad; search conditions that generated the page with which the ad was rendered; a next intermediate URL; a final destination URL; an identity of the ad creative, a topic of the content with which the ad was served; a concept of content with which the ad was served; an identity of the content with which the ad was served; information about other ads that were rendered along with the ad; a geolocation to which the ad was served; and user profile information of the user to which the ad was served. *See* Granik at p. 5, paragraph 43 ("re-direct ad URL including ... an encrypted identifier ... [and an] ultimate destination website code").

Regarding claims 19 and 38, Examiner notes that the described steps constitute a ubiquitous and well-known algorithm for base conversion necessarily included in the limitations of claim 10.

13.   Claims 13-18 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Granik in view of Tomita (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0035139)

and RFC 2396 (on URI syntax).

Regarding claims 13-16 and 32-35, RFC2396 teaches that it is well known to use

alphabets limited to specific characters for encoding information. *See generally* RFC

2396. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use the URI specifications of RFC 2396 in Granik's system

because Granik teaches the use of URLs (which are a type of URIs).

Regarding claims 17 and 36, RFC 2396 teaches that the encoded one or more

ad properties are represented with a set of K characters, wherein the set of K

characters excludes one or more characters selected from a set of characters

consisting of "control", "space", "<", ">", and "%". *See* RFC 2396 at p. 10, *Excluded US-

ASCII Characters*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use the URI specifications of RFC 2396 in Granik's

system because Granik teaches the use of URLs (which are a type of URIs).

Regarding claims 18 and 37, RFC 2396 teaches that the encoded one or more

ad properties are represented with a set of K characters, wherein the set of K

characters excludes one or more characters selected from a set of characters

consisting of "{", "}", "I", "\", "^", "[", and "]". *See* RFC 2396 at p. 11, *Excluded US-ASCII

Characters*.

Conclusion

14.   Please see the included *Notice of References Cited* for additional prior art considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure but not explicitly relied upon in this action.

15.   The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

16.   When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willow Noonan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JEFFREY PWU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER